AN OPEN LETTER TO THE SCHEER CAMPAIGN:

We were against Scheer's decision to run in the Democratic Party, and we did not give any support to his campaign for the Democratic nomination. Our opposition to Scheer's primary campaign was based not on any opposition to Scheer personally or to his program, but to working within the Democratic Party, registering people as Democrats, and accepting the idea that the Democratic Party is and should be a forum for the expression of protest. We believe in political action independent of the Democratic Party; we want to break the habit of voting Democrat even if it means we have to take some short-term "losses".

At the same time we recognized the essential difference between Cohelan and Scheer. We did not say that because both were contending for the Democratic nomination, both were basically the same. Although we could not ourselves vote for Scheer (we are not registered Democrats, nor do we want to be), we were gratified that so many Democrats --- loyal and disloyal ones --- did vote for him.

The heavy vote for Bob Scheer and the other anti-war candidates in the Democratic Primary is an indication of the strength of the widespread anti-war sentiment, and the declining electoral appeal of the "responsible liberalism" that got us into this war in the first place. When the Scheer campaign was first proposed to anti-war activists, a write-in campaign in November was part of the proposal. It was conceived at that time as a final demonstration of protest. It has become something much more important. The success of the Scheer campaign was almost equalled in other areas. The campaign of Mike Hannon in L.A. got close to 40 percent of the vote. The campaigns of Keating, Drath and Scheinbaum did as well or better.

Now the demonstrated electoral power of the anti-war movement has to be <u>used</u> --- it can't just be dribbled away. It would be a political disaster if the only peace candidate in the 7th Congressional District this November were the "lesser evil", Jeffrey Cohelan. The general elections can't be conceded to the Browns and Cohelans, but must be fought through an independent campaign which will make Cohelan sweat at least as much as the primary campaign did.

Failure to run an independent campaign in the Fall means a sort of coalition-by-default with the "responsible liberals" in order to "defeat the extreme right". In fact, some people on the left are already talking about an active coalition with the Cohelans and the Browns. For example, the June 11th "People's World", in a front-page editorial headed "New Force vs Old Peril": "...California is in trouble. The state faces the peril of capture by the ultra-Right in November.....The biggest and most difficult problem for November is the creation of the kind of coalition that can defeat the ultra-Right grab for power. Although this is the principal challenge, alongside of it there are the realizable

The general elections can't be conceded to the Browns and Cohelans, but must be fought through an independent campaign which will make Cohelan sweat at least as much as the primary campaign did.

Failure to run an independent campaign in the Fall means a sort of coalition-by-default with the "responsible liberals" in order to "defeat the extreme right". In fact, some people on the left are already talking about an active coalition with the Cohelans and the Browns. For example, the June 11th "People's World", in a front-page editorial headed "New Force vs Old Peril": "...California is in trouble. The state faces the peril of capture by the ultra-Right in November.....The biggest and most difficult problem for November is the creation of the kind of coalition that can defeat the ultra-Right grab for power. Although this is the principal challenge, alongside of it there are the realizable aims of electing a substantial number of pro-peace and anti-poverty candidates who came through the primary." We wonder who these "pro-peace" candidates can be?

The technical problems of an independent campaign are difficult but not insurmountable. Having run in the Democratic primary, Scheer is ineligible to have his name on the ballot in November. Moreover, all those who registered Democratic in order to vote for Scheer are now ineligible to sign a petition to put some other candidate on the ballot. Nevertheless, it might be possible to get enough signatures to nominate as an independent candidate someone who would be closely associated with Scheer --- perhaps Ann Scheer. If such devices are unworkable, a write-in campaign or a "Vote-No-For-Congress" campaign would be other possibilities.

Jeffrey Cohelan and Pat Brown aren't going to change their attitude toward the war, or weaken their public support for Johnson as a result of vague threats. Even if they did, it would mean no more than any other campaign promise. We fear that a decision by the Scheer campaign to wait a month or so "to give Cohelan a chance to change his position" would just dissipate the present movement. Hundreds of Scheer precinct workers and thousands of voters would soon be caught up in the "Reagan scare". An independent campaign, once again, would be forgotten.

Beyond the Congressional elections this year lies the Presidential campaign of 1968. A serious anti-war vote in California which defeated several Democrats could lay the basis for a nationwide campaign in 1968. In that campaign the "lesser evil" candidate is liable to be Bobby Kennedy, former counsel for the McCarthy Committee.

The Left now has the opportunity of becoming a serious factor in American politics. It can --- it will have to --- decide now whether it will build its own alternative, or collapse into its old posture of humble handmaiden to one or another of the major parties.

independent socialist club P.O. Box 910

SCHEER FOR CONGRESS COMMITTEE

Will the Senate Doves Come Home to Roost?

The Senate debate on Vietnam has been, in the words of the New York Times, "a drama whose intensity and stakes had seldom been equalled in the nation's history." The televised opposition to President Johnson's policies has clearly shown that anti-war sentiment extends into the highest seats of government. Many Americans who are usually content "to go along" with the President have been encouraged to take their own doubts about Vietnam seriously. We must now speak to these people and help them to make <u>their</u> opposition visible.

Public opposition to the war cannot be left to the Senate. As James Reston pointed out (NYT, Feb. 20), "the Senators cannot really do much about it..." In a crisis, the President can always create a situation in which it is unthinkable and "unpatriotic" to repudiate his policies or his demands for additional powers. Moreover, many of the "constitutional critics" believe that a majority of Americans, acting democraticaly, have the right to determine the destiny of Vietnam. It should not surprise us if, after a full public debate and final vote in favor of Johnson, these Senators close ranks behind American intervention.

Many Senators, perhaps a majority, think that Vietnam is "the wrong war in the wrong place." It's the wrong way to fight the good fight against "Communist expansion."

These attitudes -- and the failure to understand national independence movements -- severely restrict the effectiveness of the opposition Senators. Already many of the "doves" are flocking to General Gavin's plan for limited strongholds in Vietnam. This enclave theory, if accepted, would probably lead to the complete political, economic, and psychological distruction of the Saigon government. That means an NLF victory.

The Senators are unwilling to openly "turn the country over to them (the NLF)." They will not say that America should withdraw and allow the NLF to gain power as its predecessors the Viet Minh would have gained power had the U. S. permitted elections in 1956. Rather the Senate opposition favors unworkable strategies and policies which are presented as alternatives to turning the country over to the NLF. This deception promises enormous frustration in America and a very real possibility of an even more terrible renewal of hostilities.

The failure of any clear-cut and forceful support for non-intervention among the opposition also holds forth the grim prospect of continued American involvement in independence wars. Even when American troops are finally withdrawn from Vietnam, there will be no national commitment to political and economic independence in the underdeveloped world. There will be no real content in our government's rhetoric about self-determination.

Peace and Vietnamese independence will be made possible only by a strong anti-war movement in America, world public opinion, and the resistance of the Vietnamese. But Bobby Kennedy -- not Staughton Lynd -- will "end" the war in Vietnam. And he will end it, if he can, without impairing America's ability to fight in the underdeveloped world what he would consider the right war in the right place.

What then does this dramatic, but unsatisfying debate mean for those of us with a principled opposition to American military intervention?

Unlike at the time of the bombing lull in December, we must publicly respond to "what's happening out there." But our response must make clear that we are fighting not just for free debate and discussion, and not at all for a democratically determined, limited military intervention in Vietnam or anywhere else. We welcome the dissent of the Senate doves. We, however, must insist on the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam and a true commitment to non-intervention.

SMW

***

WHERE'S JEFFERY??

Our absentee Congressman was out of town (as usual), and found out about the sit-in at his office second hand. Jeffery can't understant so much opposition to President Johnson and to himself.

This is what I call political guerrilla warfare", he so shrewdly commented.

Jeffery did find time to send his constituents (the VDC) a telegram. He regretted Lyndon's bombing of North Vietnam; He praised his president as"one of the most dynamic and able leaders of our time. Jeffery's regret is easily understood: He is, as he says, "more do e than hawk," but he's still one of Lyndon's birds. C'est la guerre.

Jeffery also regrets the fact that people want him to debate Bob Scheer. He's probably afraid that the subtlety of his position would be lost.

"I do not believe", he wired, " "(that) a debate, particularly at this time, would serve any useful purpose." We shouldn't be too hard on poor Jeffery It isn't easy repeating over and over "President Johnson, may he always be right, but right or wrong, President Johnson."

Jeffery isn't exactly flying high with his former supporters either. He again voted "yes" on the HUAC appropriation. Earlier he backed a measure to transfer HUAC's witchhunting to the House Judiciary Committee. But when that failed Jeffry figured that a bad HUAC was better than no HUAC at all.

***

We forgot the disclaimer formula - but the views here are not necessarily those of the campaign.

THE OAKLAND SCHOOLS

A Poor Education for All

Warren Friedman

Though the Oakland school system is not a monolith, Oakland has managed to cheat all its children of a good education. Each school has a particular set of problems and a particular neighborhood context. Research on the district will make the same error made by the Board of Education and the administrators of Federal funds, unless the problems of each school and the neighborhood and City pressures on them are thoroughly investigated. So far our research has been focused on generalities.

In 1963, (a new study should be out in about a week) 16 of the schools in the District had 75% or more Negro students, 27 had 75% or more Caucasian students, and 21 had less than 75% of either Caucasian or Negro students. These schools are considered to be "integrated".

Education in Oakland is not even "separate but equal"; the whiter the school, the more experienced the teachers. The mean percent of non-tenured teachers in 1963 was: Negro schools, 42.5: Caucasian, 20; "integrated", 33. The blacker the school, the greater is the amount of teacher turnover.

Until the controversy over the racially-gerrymandered boundaries for Skyline High School, the Board would not admit that racial factors and poverty were relevant concerns. Since then there has been much talk and many city, state, and federal programs which merely patch the system and momentarily quiet community protest. There has been no attempt to deal with the sources of the problem.

Probably the best program now going is the Pre-school Program. It is designed to prepare ghetto children for the demands of school. But even this, discounting its allegedly middle class bias, will only serve to dump these children into overcrowded, segregated classes taught by underpaid teachers with non-professional duties.

The parents and teachers who are interested in education (not to be confused with the PTA) continually call for boundary changes and busing. The Board responds by spending hundreds of thousands of dollars which take up playground space and perpetuate de facto segregation.

In the 1965-66 budget, $20,000 is allotted for busing "hill area" students from home to school; $5,000 is allotted for transportation for "culturally disadvantaged" children. The School District's philosophy is reflected not only on a general level; it appears in the unequal distribution of supplies among schools and in the ready suspension of Negro students. 835 students of both races are suspended each month.

Children of poverty areas are not the only ones to suffer. Oakland's well paid and top-heavy administrative machinery makes all the decisions. Teachers are poorly paid (Oakland teachers' salaries are 14th out of the 18 largest California school districts) and evidently work in an atmosphere of fear.

Controversy in the classroom is discouraged. Teachers have been transfered from one school to another with very little advance not-

ice, and usually pressure from the right. It is also at least an occasional practice for an administrator to ask a student to classify his teacher as conservative, liberal or "way out".

The gereral atmosphere of the district discourages experimentation by the teachers and drives many into the suburbs in search of higher pay. Consequently the ratio of experienced to non-tenured teachers is low and getting worse. In 1958, 52% of the staff had less than 10 years experience; in 1965 it was 55%.

In a system which must appear hopeless to many of those who are on the inside, one suspects that t those who remain have adjusted. This would explain, in part, the large membership of the conservative Oakland Teachers' Association, about one thousand, and the small membership of the more militant Oakland Federation of Teachers, about 350.

Oakland has many neighborhood groups which are protesting against the conditions in the school system. These groups are concerned with the entire spectrum of issues, from an incident at a single school to the general problem of de facto segregation.and boundaries.

We should encourage these groups to gather around their common interests. Each neighborhood group may be able to alleviate specific conditions, but unless the groups are brought together, they can never hope to change the system.

The Scheer campaign can offer a context for the individual problems of each school, encourage a congress of these groups which will deal with the general problems of the system, and publicize our research on the School Board and its relation to the power structure. We can throw what power we have into the solution of individual school's problems.

But we will be relevant to Oakland's population and their concern for education only by showing a willingness to be led by these groups if our help is wanted.

Although it can only be determined by direct contact, it may be fruitful to organize high school students. They might provide the motive power for bringing more parents into the neighborhood groups or for forming new ones.

While the effort in Oakland shouldn't rely on crisis situations, a combination of angry students and angry parents might create a confrontation which would dramatize the need for an overtly political approach to educational problems.

An issue around which a confrontation or movement might materialize is the method of discipline used in the ghetto and the presence of police at Negro schools. The possibility of working in this way can only be measured by intensive work around the schools.

***

Great Society Priorities:

We spend $27.4 million per day on Vietnam. Only $800,000 was allocated to Oakland for the War on Poverty for a whole year.

1500 North Vietnamese are reportedly infiltrating South Vietnam each month. That means almost a half million dollars for each North Vietnamese "aggressor".

BARDT AND JOBART

The Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BARTD), is a publically financed corporation, organized to solve the problems of traffic congestion in the Bay Area. BARTD should serve the public through every phase of its existence--planning, construction and operation. In this it has failed and it is failing in those same areas in which our society is supposed to pride itself: equality of opportunity and democratic control.

There has been widespread job discrimination suffered by minority peoples at the hands of craft unions contracted by BARTD and no planning for the needed crash training programs of local people to do the construction work. BARTD demonstrates its callous attitudes and actions toward the families it has displaced along the right of way, in its indifference to the effects of noisy surface and elevated trains, and the shoddy nature of its coordination with Muni and A-C transit lines.

Bay Area people have begun to move on this issue. Justice on Bay Area Rapid Transit (JOBART)--a coalition of civil rights, community and religious groups--has demanded that local tax dollars be spent by BARTD to employ local people. According to JOBART, there is an abundance of federal money through the Man Power Development and Training Act for training unskilled people. Such money has been used in the past by unions, contractors and businessmen of all types. This program would supplement the apprentice program of trade unions which have proved inadequate to train sufficient workers.

Job training, unemployment and hiring discrimination are all problems made visible by BARTD. JOBART demands presented to BARTD were answered by passing the buck to the contractors and unions, which have cornered the labor market. Yet public responsibility for the unemployed and underemployed is what is at issue.

The enterprise will necessitate major relocation for people living along the route: San Pablo to Hearst, Shattuck to Adeline, and Grove Street to downtown Oakland. The distruction of homes to clear the route of the district's lines has brought tragedy to many people involved. Prices paid to the homeowners are based on the assessed values of the homes, not their market value. Thus many people are deprived of their life savings and security for their old age. They are paid prices which come nowhere near the actual value or what would be required to purchase a comparable home elsewhere. Administrators assume no responsibility for the consequences of their actions to the people they displace.

Another manifestation of this cynical attitude toward people is evident in the decision to build elevated trainways in poor residential areas in North Oakland, Berkeley, and Richmond. This type of elevated structure has been destructive to communities where they have been built, i.e. Philadelphia, Boston, and Chicago. BARTD says a train going 80 miles per hour will be "virtually silent." Experienced engineers deny this assertion. Perhaps BARDT remembers the Third Avenue "L" of NYC and realizes that more homeless people can find shelter beneath the "L" than can warm themselves over subway exhausts.

Paul Richards

A STRAGEGY FOR "CAMPUS COMMUNITY FOR SCHEER"

suggestions by Jerry Rubin

The goal fo the Scheer campaign on campus is, as I see it, to develop a mass movement around the strategy of community education and community organization. A mass movement is distinguished by a number of elements: the climate of opinion is charged with excitement, intensity and urgency about the activity; people change their lives because of the movement; thousands are involved on every level, acting spontaneously, acting even without specific assignment. FSM was a mass movement. A feeling of community participation, resulting in thousands of individual actions, prevailed, as opposed to a bureacracy.

If this occurs on the Berkeley campus this spring, it will mean an epochal advance in the student movement. The Scheer campaign represents a challenge and opportunity to the student movement. It says: Demonstrations, however important, are not enough. Campus-based radicalism is isolated and therefore less effective than it could be. If we are serious, we must get off the campus and we must try to communicate: we must try to build a movement from below that is serious about political change, that is serious about going from protesting to challenging power. We must try to use our numbers and our ideas to reach new people.

I argue that the Scheer campaign is the logical development of a mass protest movement that has involved thousands of people in demonstrations in different issues for three years: 1963--civil rights; 1964--FSM; 1965--Vietnam. These demonstrations have succeeded in dominating the morality of this area. But no organization has outlasted the single issue, no base exists outside the campus, and lasting effects are hard to see.

If the thousands of people who have picketed, demonstrated and gone to jail in the past would now dedicate themselves to knocking on doors, handing out literature, and talking to non-radical people in the next three months, we could shake up this district. We could challenge American policy where it hurts: politically. Three thousand radical organizers, serious about communicating with people and willing to work could go a long way to creating a new political movement.

We have what the Establishment, including the Democratic Party, lacks: people. We have thousands of people, and I am idealistic enough to believe that people can make a difference. We don't have the press and we face the hostility of Establishment bureaucracies, like labor. But cannot a movement

that can bring thousands of people into the streets demonstrating publish its own newspaper to communicate with people? Can't we hold street rallies through Berkeley and Oakland? Can't we reach personally virtually every citizen in this district? We have the making of a potentially large non-Establishment constituency: the student movement, the disaffiliated left-liberal middle class community, and the ghettos. We must get off the campus and we must go beyond single-issue politics. Our protest actions are large enough that we can now begin talking about building alternatives.

I see the purposes of the Scheer campaign as, briefly:

1. To conduct mass community education and propaganda around American intervention in Vietnam and lack of democracy at home.
2. To begin the cultivation and development of a new political organization in this area.
3. To register as large a protest vote as possible against Johnson's policies in Vietnam and the "Great Society."

Going into electoral politics has its advantages and its dangers. The advantages of an election is that it gives focus to the education, and puts our alternative on a level the American people have been conditioned to understand: elections. Teh dangers of the electoral process are that it has its own logic, and we who are trying to change the society might, consciously or unconsciously fall into various traps. It is my opinion that if we maintain the style of the student movement, we can avoid these dangers.

the student movement has produced a new morality in politics, a morality which stems from ethics and a feeling of community, and which rejects the system of horsetrading, you-scratch-my-back-I'll-scratch-yours symptomatic of American politics. Honesty and morality mark the student movement; individuals who justify their actions in the name of Higher Bureaucracy, be it the University of California, the USA or the Democratic Party, stand outside the movement. In addition, the student movement rejects backroom, elite politics in favor of mass, democratic politics, done in public. Leaders are responsible to the community of individuals.

If this style is maintained, there will be no consideration of changing one's program in order to get more votes---a practice often justified by electoral logic. In addition, rather than our working for Bob Scheer or the Democratic machine---normal electoral practice---it will be Scheer working for us.

A comment on the Democratic Party is needed here. Since this campaign does represent the new style of moral politics, rejecting the morality of horsetrading, the Democratic Party is thereby rejected as an agent of needed social change. We are using the Democratic Party as a forum to pronounce a

radical alternative. We are building our own counter-power based around a radical program within the Democratic Party, because there is no other forum. The election laws are so rigged that it is virtually impossible to run as an independent. We must be careful that this campaign, in its program of community education, does not confuse people about the need for independent political action.

So much for the campaign in general. Now for some comments on on-campus activity.

I believe that the Scheer campaign must be infused with the community of protest on the campus. Rather than being just another bureaucratic group with its sectarian activities, it should attempt to create a communal feeling on campus. This means that all decisions are communicated directly to the campus by rally and campaign bulletin. This means that collective effort, with a long-range strategy, is emphasized.

Specifically, I suggest that CCFS produce a weekly Campaign Bulletin which discusses the campaign, its progress and decisions, week by week with the campus community. This bulletin would also include an analysis weekly of Vietnam events and life in Oakland, attempting to develop an Oakland consciousness on campus.

In addition, I suggest that CCFS organize at least one major rally a week. This rally could include speakers which we fly in from outside the area if necessary. The rally will have three purposes: it will be a weekly radical discussion series; it will include campaign speakers who will discuss the progress of the campaign with the campus; and it will attempt to mobilize the campus for campaign work.

The CCFS will meet every Thursday night. I suggest that the first hour of these meetings be educational: either discussions about Oakland-Berkeley problems or discussions about community work. The rest of the meeting will make decisions and plan work. These meetings and discussions should work to develop a common consciousness so that the June primary is not the end, but the beginning.

The CCFS should have a table on campus from 8 a. m. to 4 p. m. selling buttons and bumper stickers, taking sign-ups, selling literature and organizing people for community work.

A major responsibility for CCFS will be organizing the campus. This includes increasing the number of people who are willing to work for the campaign by visiting dormitories and the campus residential area. This also

includes registering the thousands of campus people so that they can vote for Scheer. I suggest that registration take place after the radical nature of the campaign has been defined, and that it take place in the form of a two-week blitz, with the explicit purpose of registering only those people who intend to vote for Scheer, and combining registration with educational forums on the need for independent political action.

The main responsibility of CCFS will be to ehlp reach every voter in Berkeley and Oakland. The area is divided into precincts, each of which contains approximately 250 voters. There needs to be a captain for each precinct. This captain would take as his responsibility for the next three months that precinct: spending at least 10 hours a week in that area, talking at length to every voter, setting up parties and house meetings which Scheer could attend, helping to organizing neighborhood discussion groups on the war, organizing street rallies, taking a detailed research of the area, stirring up the community , and above all, trying to find people in each precinct who would work on the campaign by also going door-to-door and maybe turning their garage into an anti-war headquarters. When election time comes, the precinct captains will know who in their area are likely to vote for Scheer. A get-out-the-vote campaign, therefore, could be quite scientific and quite successful.

The goal of precinct work is, the, to (a) to find neighborhood people to become active with the campaign and set up neighborhood organization; (b) to stir discussion about the war and democracy in America; and (c) to convince people to cast votes in June against Johnson's policy. With the numbers of people from campus willing to work on this campaign, we could communicate at length personally with every voter, and we could build up a voter information system in this area which would be the envy of machine politicians.

It is crucial that campus people volunteer at least 10 hours a week to take responsibility for three months for a designated precinct. Meetings should be held very often with all precinct workers so that they can discuss common problems and experiences, and feel part of a collective effort to build the anti-war movement from below. We have much to learn on how to communicate with non-radical people on the war and American society; we must work together to improve.

Once precinct captains are found for Berkeley and Oakland, and this will require about 800 committed people, the CCFS must find people who will take responsibility for setting up Vietnam information tables in front of places where people work, shop and enjoy; arranging blitz leafleting throughout the campaign at factories, downtown areas, etc.; and helping on overall campaigh committees: finance, propaganda, special events, etc.

Saturday and Sunday should be mobilization days for CCFS. A call should be made to the campus all week to come to the Telegraph office over the weekend and help precinct captains go door-to-door, help leaflet, help set up information tables, help arrange rallies, etc. At the end of the weekend mobilizations the people should meet in workshops and discuss their experiences.

CCFS should also have an active finance committee whose main job might be organizing students to give from $2 to $5 a month to the campaign on a regular basis. Besides being a needed source of funds, this will increase the commitment of the campus to the campaigh. The money could be earmarked for special purposes, like buying TV time for Scheer's challenge to debate Cohelan.

The Telegraph Avenue Office (2495 Telegraph) should be manned by CCFS from morning to night to organize people who walk off the street to work on the campaign. Everyone should be urged to accept defined responsibility.

The CCFS should play careful attention to the role direct action will play in the campaign. The use of direct action, including civil disobedience, has been a reflection of our lack of confidence in the ability of the legitimate channels of American society to effect change. We sit in because only pressure wil will cause the man upstairs, whoever he may be, to respond either to our voices or to simple morality. We march because their is no way to stop the Vietnam madness. Confrontation politics has been the brightest political development in America since McCarthyism. This campaign is in no sense a rejection of these tactics; it grows out of them; indeed, it is a continuous demonstration.

Scheer's candidacy is a protest---it is not an affirmation of the American electoral process. CCFS should plan numerous direct actions to dramatize the issues we are raising intellectually. We might consider a major march in opposition to the war in the spring. Since CBS refused our advertising, we might consider direct action there. If Cohelan persists in his refusal to debate, we might consider more direct action. We should be active in the demonstrations around Charter Day and Ambassador Goldberg's appearance.

We should appeal to all those who have marched and demonstrated in the past: Now we must communicate. Now we must go into the community and try to build opposition. We have a moral and personal responsibility to organize and work against a liberal congressman who apologizes and votes for a liberal's war in Vietnam.

One final comment of ideological motivation. It is true that a large vote for Scheer in the June primary would be a major demonstration against Johnson's policies in Vietnam. It would show that the protest movement has political stomach. It would actually threaten the Johnson consensus--and threaten it from the left! It would have worldwide significance.

However, this is so only if it is clear that Scheer is a candidate who stands fro immediate withdrawl of American troops from Vietnam and for a radical reconstruction of domestic political and economic institutions. It should also be clear that Scheer is not a Democrat. A large vote for Scheer must be honest. People must be clear that when they are voting for Scheer they are voting against American suppression of the Vietnamese revolution and they are casting an anti-Establishment vote. This is the only effect of this campaign as a protest campaign. Scheer is not a reform Democrat.

It would be a fatal error if people felt that as Congressman, Scheer could do anything. Our system of horsetrading is so total that unless Scheer committed himself to remaining outside that broker game, he would soon be swallowed up in it. Scheer must admit, and all campaign workers should agree, that maybe the most important thing he can do as congressman is to do and say the honest things that might have him impeached by fellow House members. As congressman, Scheer should speak the truth, not speak for the interests of selfish pressure groups. As congressman, Scheer should spend much of his time in Berkeley and Oakland organizing the people and participating in demonstrations. Thus getting elected is not the crucial thing; registering a high protest vote is more important; and more curcial than that is educating people organize against the power structure.

This is related to CCFS in the following way: I suggest that we see ourselves not as an organization for Scheer, but as an organization committed to building a new political movement in this area, a movement that is now in the Democratic primary, and that tomorrow will be in an independent write-in campaign. We are building a radical movement that is relevant, that is involved, and that goes directly to the people. We are not participating in a one-shot deal; we are organizing for the future---for a struggle against American American interventionism that may take 20 years to win. We are in guerilla warfare.

What is new about the Scheer campaign is that it goes to the people, and that it goes from protest to protest-power politics. What is new about the Scheer campaign is that it not only asks people to carry a picket sign, but it asks them to work and talk with their neighbors. We can introduce the idea of the radical civil service with this campaign.

As we work, we must talk abouttransforming CCFS into a Movement for New Politics in the Bay Area. When the primary is over, those campus radicals who have principles objection to the Democratic Party will join us.

In our door-to-door work we must be honest with people. We should advise them that they must organize themselves at the grassroots level to exercise leverage against the corporate state.

These are my ideas, and I know that they will provoke as much controversy as agreement. Let us discuss these goals and ideas for the next four months as we work.

WORK FOR SCHEER

Congressional Campaign, Primary Election, June 7

The war in Vietnam has revealed the inadequacy of traditional politics in America.

How is it that the principle of self-determination is used to justify intervention in Vietnam?

How is it that our best effort against poverty is to train people for jobs that don't exist?

How is it that an immense number of Americans acquiesce to a policy because "they must support the government," forgetting that they <u>are</u> the government?

The language of democracy in America is being turned into the rhetoric of hypocrisy. We must recapture the most brilliant impulses of our tradition. We must create a new politics that violates the gentlemen's agreement to avoid the most crucial issues and that engages the people in their own decisions. The Scheer campaign is an attempt to do this.

We therefore ask you to consider the attached policy statements from two points of view. First, of course, you will be able to examine in some detail the program and rationale of the campaign. But in addition it should be realized that it is not directed merely at the campus community. It is an example of the literature we would have you take to the outside community. Its truthfulness and clarity of principle are a startling departure from the innoccuous muddle that has become the political norm.

The potential support for the Scheer candidacy is tremendous. The goals of the campaign have a stark immediacy in this district. You can see in the Oakland ghetto the inadequacy of the "Great Society" programs. You can see the lines of draftees at the induction centers.

From the standpoint of mobilizing this support, the campus community is crucial. The effectiveness of the campaign depends on the catalytic force of this sector. Accordingly, we call upon you to take the campaign to the people of this district, who have been disillusioned by long experience with phoney politics; to take your commitment and energy to people who have learned to withhold theirs, and to engage them in a dramatic assertion of grass-roots political power.

Across the country people will be watching this campaign. In Washington the politicians will be assessing its danger to their positions. We must impress upon them the magnitude of popular dissatisfaction with their policies. In the normal course of events the incumbent, Cohelan, would have had automatic Democratic Party endorsement, and since most people in this district vote Democratic as the lesser evil, he would easily have won this election. We intend to prevent this. It will not be business as usual this year in Oakland.

VIETNAM

The United States never should have gone into Vietnam, never should have stayed there, and must now get out.

The Administration tries to justify American presence in Vietnam as a defense of South Vietnam against "aggression from the North." But what are the facts?

The guerrilla war in South Vietnam is a revolution against a succession of Saigon dictators who have little popular backing. These Saigon "governments" could not remain in power for one week without military support from the United States. The guerrilla fighters of the Communist-led National Liberation Front are almost entirely native South Vietnamese; they control two-thirds of the country, and rely upon peasant support for food, shelter, information and protection. To the Vietnamese, the NLF is a continuation of the revolutionary coalition which earlier fought against the Japanese and the French.

American experts concede that support for the NLF has increased almost in proportion to the build-up of American forces. Every day that Americans remain in Vietnam, more and more Vietnamese identify with the 25-year struggle for complete independence from foreign domination.

The United States has responded by bombing NLF areas of the Vietnamese countryside to make them uninhabitable. This strategy, calculated to turn the Vietnamese peasants into a refugee population, is immoral. Its objective--to force the NLF to stop fighting--is unrealistic.

The United States claims that it is for "peace" in Vietnam. But to ask the Vietnamese to accept "peace" without independence is a complete denial of what they have been giving their lives for. The Vietnamese have many reasons to distrust the United States. They consider us aggressors who are devastating their country. And they have not forgotten that once before--in 1954--Vietnamese revolutionaries laid down their arms in return for a promise of elections--elections which Diem, our puppet, prevented because he feared a likely Communist victory.

The Vietnamese--and most of the world--consider Vietnam to be a single country. According to the Geneva Agreements of 1954, the division into "North" and "South" was meant to be only temporary. Vietnam was to have been reunited by the 1956 elections which Diem prevented. Although President Johnson now claims to endorse the principles of the Geneva Agreements, his policies continue to prevent the reunification of Vietnam.

To continue these policies, to perpetuate this war which even our traditional allies do not support--and which a number of U.S. Senators have also protested--means the continuing corruption of our democratic ideals at home. We have seen the powers of the President expand unchecked, the Congress ignored, the Constitution violated, the American people consistently lied to by their government, and dissent condemned as treason.

To continue the war also means that the desperate social problems we face at home will remain neglected. Instead of rebuilding American cities, we will burn Vietnamese village. Unemployment, ghetto housing, the urgent need for more hospitals and schools--all these must wait while we destroy Vietnam.

For there to be peace, the U.S. must first stop the bombing of both North and South Vietnam. We must recognize the NLF as a legitimate political force. We must implement the Geneva Agreements of 1954 by immediately withdrawing all U.S. troops from Vietnam and dismantling all U.S. bases there. The only basis for our negotiations with the NLF and other political groups in the country should be the details of our withdrawal.

OAKLAND

Oakland is a frightened city. People fear the police; City Hall fears another "Watts"; the Congressman fears a dialogue with his constituents.

America's failure to deal with the crisis in her cities parallels her failures in foreign policy: there are striking similarities between Oakland and Vietnam. In both places, poor people live in miserable conditions, unable to change their lives. A self-perpetuating "ruling class" lives in comfort, isolated from the majority of the people, and has neither the desire nor the ability to bring about basic social change. A brutal police force keeps the poor in line. The "foreign aid" from Washington never seems to reach the people who need it. There has been no violent uprising in Oakland yet, but the local and federal governments fear that one is imminent.

Conditions in Oakland are shocking. The unemployment rate is ten percent, twice the national average. Among Negroes the unemployment rate is twenty-five percent, and at least one out of three Negro youths is out of school and out of work. A callous and paternalistic welfare department doles out inadequate relief funds while deliberately intimidating the recipients. Housing conditions are terrible--and getting worse: in the last decade 11,000 low-income family units were destroyed to make room for freeways and factories. Schools are segregated and substandard.

Consider the plight of a 16-year old Negro youth living in Oakland. His school is more concerned with keeping him in line than with giving him a meaningful education. He is treated like a delinquent and is liable to be expelled on the slightest pretext. When he leaves school he will have no job, no skills, no prospects. What does the power structure--City Hall, the Chamber of Commerce, the Economic Redevelopment bureaucracy--have to offer him? "Industrial expansion"!

The power structure's recipe for all the problems of Oakland is to give money --in tens of millions--to attract industry. But little of this money goes toward creating the new jobs that are so desperately needed.

The War on Poverty is a fraud. The Hunter Report, paid for (and suppressed) by City Hall, concludes that 60 to 80 million dollars are needed to begin to make a dent in Oakland's poverty. The War on Poverty allots Oakland $800,000 a year, less than the cost of one United States plane shot down in Vietnam. But even additional funds will do little to help the poor as long as the poor have no control over their use. The War on Poverty was designed by City Hall, approved by Washington, and is administered by a political bureaucracy in which the poor have no voice.

A real war on poverty must begin with an attack on the Oakland power structure. It must challenge the power of the Knowlands and the Coakleys: it cannot be entrusted to them. Only if the poor organize themselves to gain political and economic power can they express their deepest needs through political action, rather than through another Watts. But another Watts would not be the worst thing that could happen to Oakland: the worst would be for the present poverty and misery to continue.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE SCHEER FOR CONGRESS CAMPAIGN?

The people of this district have demonstrated overwhelming opposition to the Vietnam war. We believe that they want and need the opportunity to express that opposition in electoral politics. With Scheer running for Congress, the June 7th primary election will be a referendum for or against remaining in Vietnam.

The campaign will also offer a political alternative to the Johnson consensus on domestic issues. For us, America's brutal policy in Vietnam is not an isolated incident. The Vietnam war is the mirror image of a society which permits its cities to decay, its poor to remain poor and powerless, and its minorities to be harrassed.

The campaign will raise a new image of what society can and should be. We will talk of freeing American technology from producing for private profit, of harnessing the wonders of automation and cybernetics to provide for people's needs. We will speak of extending democracy from the ballot box to where people work, live and study. And we will fight for legislation which can move American society closer to these ideals.

We believe it is time for a "New Politics" in America which is connected to and draws inspiration from Civil Rights, Peace and Student protest movements.

WHO IS ROBERT SCHEER?

Foreign Editor of Ramparts Magazine, Scheer is a widely respected speaker, journalist, and political analyst. He has also been an activist and leader in Bay Area protests over the past eight years--the demonstrations against the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Sheraton Palace and Auto Row civil rights sit-ins, and the recent marches and rallies against American intervention in Vietnam.

Scheer is the author of How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam, called by many critics, including The Nation magazine, the most important book written about the war in Vietnam. In March of this year he returned from a second tour of South Vietnam and Cambodia.

Scheer is 29 and a native of New York, where his parents worked in the garment industry. A former teaching assistant and Ford Foundation fellow, Bob lives in Berkeley with this wife Anne. Like Bob, Anne is a political activist and will soon be sentenced for her part in the San Francisco sit-ins of 1964.

WHO IS THE SCHEER FOR CONGRESS COMMITTEE?

Last summer a group of East Bay citizens attempted to convince Congressman Cohelan to publicly oppose the war. Dismayed by their failure, they began a search for a new candidate for Congress.

During the same period, the Vietnam Day Committee sponsored a dramatic series of direct actions and marches. The participation in these events demonstrated that vast numbers of people in this district oppose the war. The success of VDC suggested to many people that even greater opposition could be demonstrated in electoral activity.

After many discussions, a campaign committee was established to support Scheer for Congress. This campaign committee represents a coalition from CDC (the California Democratic Council) to VDC. On the committee there are socialists, liberal Democrats, radicals, communists, reformers, and people who have never before participated in politics. We are agreed that our differences are less important than the need to work together on this campaign, and we will exclude no one from participating who is in general agreement with us.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE PRESENT CONGRESSMAN?

Jeffrey Cohelan considers himself "more dove than hawk." Yet he has voted for every war appropriation and has steadfastly apologized for every escalation of the war. A "liberal," he has regularly voted "yes" on appropriations for the House Un-American Activities Committee. He has failed even to criticize the poverty program for its inability to meet the needs of the poor people in his district.

Even to his supporters Cohelan seems faceless. He is seldom in his district, and he consistently refuses to speak out on crucial local issues. Publicly he has said nothing about the right of Oakland children to free lunches in school, nothing about the right of free speech at the University of California, and nothing about the right of demonstrators to march through the streets of Oakland.

We have invited Cohelan to debate Scheer. He has refused--a further example of his failure to treat the people of this district seriously.

WHY IS THIS CAMPAIGN IN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY PRIMARY?

California election laws make it almost impossible to run for Congress as an independent. The Democratic Party, therefore, is the only available forum in which we could present a political alternative to the people. In addition, most of the voters who are ready for a real debate on the Vietnam war are at present registered Democrats.

At the same time, the Democratic Party machine is geared to marshall support for the war--as shown by Governor Brown's successful attempt to dump CDC President Simon Casady. We will maintain in this campaign complete independence from the Democratic Party Establishment. In fact, most of the people in this campaign, including the candidate, believe that America must have a new political moverment separate from the existing parties.

WHO'S PAYING FOR THE CAMPAIGN?

Because of our political program we neither expect nor want help from the business and political manipulators who buy and sell most election campaigns. Thus we have to rely on mailing fund-raising requests to people who have spoken out against the war, on passing the hat at rallies and meetings, and on small fund-raising parties. The deficit is made up by underpaying the full-time staff.

ARE WE TRYING TO WIN?

Yes. The primary election will be a Vietnam referendum. A vote for Scheer will be seen as a vote for American withdrawal from Vietnam. It is crucial that we get as many votes as possible. If we are successful in taking this campaign to every home ans street corner in this district, we can win. However, we will not measure our success only by the number of votes we receive. More important is our success in stirring debate, dialogue and protest, and in developing an ongoing, articulate political movement in this area.

WHAT KIND OF CONGRESSMAN WOULD SCHEER BE?

Scheer would be the voice of the unrepresented in the House of Representatives. He would not receive important committee assignments, not be invited to the White House, and not dispense federal patronage to his supporters. Rather than participate in the congressional game of horse-trading, he would spend most of his time in his district--working with the people to organize politically, and to engage in direct actions when necessary to press their demands. Scheer does not believe that Washington can solve basic problems without the development of grass-roots political organization.

BASIC PLATFORM OF THE SCHEER CAMPAIGN

Foreign Affairs

** Immediately, unconditionally and permanently stop the bombing of North and South Vietnam, withdraw our troops, and dismantle our bases in Vietnam. We must recognize the National Liberation Front as a major indigenous political force, and negotiate the details of our withdrawal with them.

** Stop all United States military aid to underdeveloped countries. Such aid maintains repressive and undemocratic governments in power, while the majority of the people live in poverty.

** Recognize the rights of underdeveloped countries to achieve political and economic independence by revolution. Revolution is needed in these countries to overthrow archaic social structures that prevent progress and support privilege. Recalling our own nation's struggle for independence, we should stop playing the role of world policeman hindering revolution.

** Let each country decide for itself what kind of government it wants, even if it is a Communist one. The basis of American foreign policy should be self-determination, not anti-Communism. Anti-Communism is so pathological that in Vietnam we choose to kill people rather than permit them to live under Communism. Anti-Communism denies the reality that Communist revolutions differ from place to place, and often are popular and nationalistic. In each case, let the people of the country concerned decide--not the American State Department.

** Stop intervening in Latin America. The United States should withdraw its troops from the Dominican Republic and its anti-guerrilla advisory teams from the Latin American countries in which they operate. Our policy of maintaining a sphere of influence in Latin America is keeping the people there from self-determination.

** Support the end of colonialism in Africa. United States policy in Africa should support revolutionary movements in Angola, Mozambique, South Africa, Rhodesia, and the Congo. Direct or indirect foreign intervention, including the operations of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency, must cease.

** In sum, American policy should recognize the right of revolution and self-determination; should give the type of economic aid, including heavy machinery, which fosters the political and economic independence of underdeveloped countries; should take major specific steps toward complete nuclear disarmament; and should join all nations, including China, in the United Nations. The goal of all nations should be not Cold War but the use of the world's resources to combat poverty, disease, illiteracy and inequality.

Draft Platform

SCHEER

for

CONGRESS CAMPAIGN

labor donated

INTRODUCTION

Two issues dominate American politics today, undeclared war in Vietnam and desperate poverty at home. Robert Scheer is campaigning for the Democratic nomination for Congress in the 7th C.D., and his basic claim is that the two issues are inseparable: increased war costs abroad mean less money for civilian projects at home; brutal measures abroad lead to loss of freedom--political and social--at home. Scheer is campaigning against an incumbent Democrat who loyally supports the Johnson administration. Scheer's charge is that the liberalism which supports war in Vietnam and tolerates erosion of American freedom at home is vicious and destructive, that it must be replaced with a new and radical approach to the immense problem of renovating American society. His platform can be divided into foreign and domestic parts, but the involvement of each with the other is essential to understanding his criticism of America in 1966 and his belief in the possibility of political rejuvenation.

FOREIGN POLICY

At least two thirds of the world accepts without hesitation the proposition that the United States of America is the most ruthlessly imperialistic nation the world has ever known. Every day, more of the other third begins to suspect that this is true. The world finds its proof both in our foreign aid programs and in our war in Vietnam. The duty of an American Congressman in foreign affairs is to examine the realities that underlie this world-wide opinion and work to bring American actions more in line with the ideals of freedom and national self-determination which we claim to stand for. The success of the United States as a nation has made these ideals meaningful political concepts. In 1966 we are challenged by the world to live up to our own ideals, and we fall short. In the name of freedom and democracy we support fascist dictators, pay our professors to study ways to counteract leftist revolutions, and use saturation bombing in a Vietnamese civil war. What has happened to us?

In foreign aid we have confused charity with enforcing a political view. We claim to be helping certain nations "emerge," to be helping them overcome the results of centuries of colonial exploitation: overpopulation, starvation, and the poverty that comes from agricultural or one-product economies. It is hugely to our credit that we concern ourselves with such disinterested work, yet in practice our foreign aid is chained to an ideology which we attempt to force-feed to the recipients of our generosity. Senator Fulbright has cautioned America about its "arrogant" power, and in foreign aid our arrogance, our belief that we alone know the ways in which men can be free, happy and rich, clearly shows itself.

We pledged to help India establish a steel industry, the first and major step in the creation of a modern, flexible, industrial economy. This first step is at once the most difficult and most essential for a nation seeking to raise itself to the point where its people do not face starvation every year. The United States Congress reneged on the pledge of assistance when it discovered that the mills were to be state-owned, that they would reek of "socialism." This is the arrogance of our economic power. We demand that India model its economy on our own system of private capitalism before we will grant it foreign "aid." This is not aid, but economic blackmail, and ludicrous blackmail at that, for the US Congress was demanding that India, an overpopulated and divided nation in 1960, do what America, underpopulated, homogeneous and rich, did 75 years ago. With its population threatened by starvation, India cannot afford the anarchic progress America has made to richness. India needs economic planning and speed in directed development if it is to stave off disaster. The ludicrousness of the American demand strikes nearly everyone but a voting majority of Congress. The serious implications of such Congressional behavior are not quite so evident, but they must concern every Congressman, for the implications are that American foreign aid is given under false pretenses. Under the guise of aid, we simply create new areas for American capital to make money for American investors. Who are the Indian Mellons, Rockefellers and Carnegies who were to buy shares in that privately owned steel mill Congress envisioned? They simply do not exist, although there are plenty of American corporations seeking overseas investment opportunities.

The most defensible part of American reluctance to aid socialist or even communist nations is our concern for the abridgments of personal liberty common in such regimes. But Congress must realize that most nations, given the choice between planned economies and starvation, will choose economic planning, whether socialistic, communistic, state-socialistic, or any of the other descriptive tags currently in use. Bluntly, it is grub first, then ethics. Is America to deny underdeveloped nations this choice, the choice of life over death? What we must do is work generously, as we have not done in the past, for the true sovereignty of nations and the true self-determination of peoples, in Latin America, in Asia, and in Africa. The conflict between economic advancement and personal liberty is real, but not necessarily permanent. In any case, a peon under Batista could not have been better off than he is under Castro, and very few people will venture to claim that he has not greatly improved his lot. America must work to support those popular revolutions that seek to throw off dictators who exploit their countries through our foreign aid and support themselves with our weapons. A reasonable American response to a Latin American revolutionary's demand for nationalized industry is to agree and to request adequate compensation. To send in the marines to protect oil companies is economic imperialism.

Congress must realize that there is only one agency that can afford large-scale industrial investment in underdeveloped nations, and that agency is the state. Congress must recognize this fact and stop trying to determine the ways in which other nations organize their economies, or else it must accept the stigma of economic imperialism--domination of the internal affairs of a sovereign nation by economic means. America's current economic blend of capitalism and government control is the successful result of unique circumstances that are not duplicated anywhere else in today's world. For us to demand private, capitalistic ownership of industry in India, or Indonesia, or Ghana is at least absurd,

and leaves us open to the charge of lying. For while we claim to operate for the benefit of the emerging nations, the fact remains that the United States has got back far more money from foreign aid that we have put in. We have been intelligent investors, in our terms, but economic buccaneers in the eyes of those nations that seek to nationalize foreign-owned business and thus gain control over their own economies. Congress must realize that when underdeveloped nations accuse us of economic imperialism, there is much justice in the charge.

THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT MUST CEASE ALL POLICIES THAT PROMOTE U.S. DOMINATION OF THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, OR POLITICAL LIVES OF OTHER NATIONS. SPECIFICALLY:

1. Withdraw troops from the Dominican Republic and anti-guerrilla advisers from other nations.
2. Make real economic and social progress, not anti-communism, the standard by which non-military aid programs are administered.
3. Discourage private American investment as the solution to development problems in emerging nations and support nationalization with compensation of foreign-owned industry in such nations.

In Vietnam, the United States is confronting the death of the basic myth of its foreign policy, and as the myth dies, so do Vietnamese, so far more than 350,000--if we accept the conservative figures of the Defense Department. We are fighting in Vietnam to save the Vietnamese from communism or, in the absurdly self-parodying words of W.R. Hearst Jr., from themselves, if need be. What better example of the colossal arrogance of American power than this attempt to impose our will on another nation? Because for twenty years we have refused to look at China and other communist nations as separate entities, because we have forced ourselves to believe in the demonic "communist monolith" opposed to the "free world," we now find ourselves contemplating, with appalling equanimity, the possibility of war with China to force the Viet Cong in South Vietnam to give up. Our government steadfastly refuses to believe that the Viet Cong are not controlled by a North Vietnam in turn controlled by China. The fact that North Vietnamese regulars did not appear in South Vietnam until after we bombed the north does not suggest to our government that we forced North Vietnam to take a more active part in the war. The fact that our own State Department's "white papers" say that, before the bombing, more than 90% of the Viet Cong's weapons were of American manufacture does not suggest to our government that the war in South Vietnam is essentially a civil war, fought first against the American-equipped Saigon army and now directly against an American army of 255,000 men. (At the height of the French war in Indo-China there were 25,000 French soldiers in all of South Vietnam.)

Yet, stripped of the rhetoric of saving someone, the fact of war in Vietnam is that the United States, with its ghastly firepower, is checking a 25-year Vietnamese fight for independence, first from the French, then from Japan, then from the French again, and now, most violently, from us. America, the land of Tom Paine, is refusing to allow an Asian nation the right of self-determination. The issue is now immensely complex: we are spoiling for a fight with China, there are now North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam, we escalate the war every time there is the possibility of peace. Through our brutal destruction of a whole culture--a whore in Vietnam now earns 20 times as much as a top civil servant--the United States has lost its right to any control over the future of Vietnam. We must get out. We must announce our determination to leave, and then negotiate the details of an orderly withdrawal with all interested parties, recognizing that the Viet Cong are the most interested party. We should take our puppets with us. General Ky is our man. He speaks a dialect that his "people" cannot understand when he talks directly to them. He is a foreign puppet ruler whom we support, so we must take him with us so he will not be lynched by an angry populace. This is the extent of our commitment in South Vietnam. We have forfeited the right to any other role in a country where in a single day we use more ordnance than the French did in five months.

WE MUST GET OUT OF VIETNAM. THE DETAILS OF WITHDRAWAL ARE NEGOTIABLE; THE WITHDRAWAL ITSELF IS NOT.

DOMESTIC POLICY

Poverty, racial discrimination, rioting, erosion of constitutional rights to dissent--these are not the only strokes in an image of America in 1966, but they are the major domestic issues Congress must face if it is to make America live up to the ideals of freedom and happiness which give us our distinctive sense of political possibility. For the first time in the history of the world, a nation has the resources and technology to make freedom from want and degradation possible within a single generation. Yet a walk in the Oakland ghetto or even in West Berkeley shows how radical a change we must make in our approach to modern American society before we can achieve the goal of social renovation.

Our cities are ugly and brutal places. Urban renewal has become a euphemism for Negro removal, for segregation of Negroes and Mexican-Americans in progressively more squalid ghettos while middle-income housing rises, tantalizingly beyond reach. Police, fearful of the hatreds nurtured in such poverty and despair, become vicious and sadistic. In Oakland a politically active Negro like Luther Smith can be terrorized by police who are not subject to investigation by a civilian police review board. Our whole society, fearful of internal criticism beyond the narrow limits of liberal Democrat and conservative Republican, tolerates bomb attacks on minority political groups. Governor Brown, asked his opinion of the bombing of the W.E.B. DuBois Club, said that he regretted it, but felt that Attorney General Katzenbach "called it as he saw it" when he attached the communist label to the organization. Why wasn't the Governor of the State of California outraged and ashamed that any political group in his state was bombed? The Los Angeles-Watts riots were more than murderous insurrection: they were clear and symbolic warning of what happens when desperate men look up at "fellow citizens" in the hills and feel no sense of community with them. Oakland and West Berkeley could

become another Watts. And if they did, it would not be the worst thing that could happen here. The worst thing would be for us to let the miserable conditions go on, because we know how to change them. What must a Congressman work for in 1966?

The key to renovation of American life is real peace, not the uneasy truce of the Cold War years which saw us use half our budget for non-productive military weapons. Yet, ironically, peace is a real threat without governmental assurance that people working in a wartime economy will not be out of work in a nation at peace. Congress must work now to develop programs of peacetime employment. And there will be plenty of work for everyone.

Whatever the Johnson administration and its supporters may claim, even the United States cannot afford to wage war in Southeast Asia and at the same time confront the problems of poverty and blight at home. More money, not less, is needed for domestic programs, yet cuts in civilian spending show up in every area of the current budget, because of the war. The NDEA (National Defense Education Act) has enabled thousands of needy students to attend college full-time--and incidentally to avoid the draft. President Johnson recommends cutting the program from this year's $179 million to $30 million next year. In Oakland, the Hunter Report, a study of housing discrimination paid for and then suppressed by City Hall, says that from $60 to $80 million is needed even to make a dent in Oakland's poverty and that another $100 million is needed to build sufficient housing. Huge programs of this sort, linked with on-the-spot job training, can give productive peacetime employment to everyone. Such programs are impossible in wartime. Last year Johnson's "war" on poverty in Oakland barely skirmished with the problem, allocating $800,000 to the city, less than two-thirds the cost of one Phantom, Thunderchief, or Skyhawk shot down daily in Southeast Asia. And there are a hundred Oaklands in the United States.

The Congressmen from the 7th Congressional District has two major responsibilities to his constituents. First, he must be at home to them, in touch with their problems and willing to use the tremendous prestige of his office to help them in their conflicts with city authorities. For example, the City of Oakland right now has federal funds in hand, granted for a school lunch program, yet it is not using those funds, and ghetto children are going hungry. The Congressman from the 7th District should use his presence and prestige to force the city to use those funds. Perhaps a telephone call, or a press conference, or a public demonstration is required. Robert Scheer has pledged to use his office in this way, to give real service to his constituents in their local and immediate political problems.

The Congressman's second responsibility is to speak clearly in Washington about the failings of the Johnson liberal-consensus government supported by Humphrey, Dirksen, and in the House by Jeffery Cohelan. Cohelan's supposed skill at "working behind the scenes" is not good enough for this district. He will not tell us what goes on back there, and the apparent results, escalation in Vietnam and cutbacks in civilian funds at home, are totally unacceptable. The trouble with working behind the scenes is that it does not give the people a chance to vote on issues. Cohelan says he is working behind the scenes to end the war, yet he votes for every war appropriation bill. He says he is for political freedom at home, yet he consistently votes for the funds to support the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Robert Scheer has taken unequivocal public stands on each of these issues. His election will be an endorsement of his position, and will do more to challenge the narrow view of consensus politicians than a decade of work behind the scenes in Washington cloakrooms.

The ultimate object of Robert Scheer's campaign is nothing less than raising the quality of American life. America should be a beautiful and rewarding place for all its citizens. Freeways need not destroy our cities if well-planned in conjunction with mass rapid transit. Urban renewal need not create new ghettos hidden, in the case of the East Bay, behind BART's seven foot wall between white and colored citizens. Redwood lands need not be lumbered over before a bill can be passed making them into a national park. The Grand Canyon need not be drowned to satisfy Arizona developers. Automation need not terrify workers into resisting the very machines that can free from drudge work. Americans need not be subject to the arbitrary persecutions of HUAC. And, American need not betray itself by waging gruesome and futile war in Asia. The beginning of political rejuvenation can be here, in the 7th Congressional District of California.

CONGRESS MUST GUARANTEE FULL PERSONAL FREEDOM FOR ALL AMERICAN CITIZENS. SPECIFICALLY:

1. Control city police practices by founding civilian review boards with full investigative and subpoena powers.
2. Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities.
3. Abolish punitive laws concerning birth control, abortion, and sexual practices between consenting adults.
4. Treat alcoholism and drug addiction as medical and not criminal problems.

CONGRESS MUST INVOLVE ALL CITIZENS IN REBUILDING AMERICA. SPECIFICALLY:

1. Guarantee that the poor have majority representation on redevelopment agencies like the OEDC (Oakland Economic Development Commission).
2. Convert our war economy to peacetime uses geared to the needs of workers for meaningful work, not to maximum corporate profit. Such a conversion requires establishing the rights of unionizing, and of sharing in corporate decisions about automation and its place in making labor easier for all.
3. Make federal funds available for founding independent news media to air minority opinions.
4. Remove all restrictions on the rights of American citizens to travel abroad.

CONGRESS MUST GUARANTEE EVERY CITIZEN THE RIGHT TO DECENT LIFE. SPECIFICALLY:

1. Guarantee every family an annual income of $3600 plus $100 for each dependent.
2. Use the $60 billion a year we now spend for war to rebuild and renovate our cities. Until there is full employment or guaranteed income, job priority and training must be given to residents in the areas under reconstruction.
3. Raise the minimum wage to $2 an hour (making an annual income of at least $3600) and extend coverage to all workers.

CONGRESS MUST END ALL EXISTING FORMS OF SEGREGATION IN AMERICA. SPECIFICALLY:

1. Establish meaningful training programs for the unskilled and assure them employment in the massive federal projects for urban renovation.
2. Cut off all federal funds for states, counties, or cities that have not integrated schools, public-works programs, and voting lists.
3. Pass a strong federal fair housing act.

Robert Scheer for Congress
2214 Grove St.
Berkeley 4, Calif.
Tel. 549-0690

whats the point!

POSITION PAPER ON THE VDC AND THE SCHEER CAMPAIGN

by Jack Weinberg
Marvin Garson
David Friedman

The problmes which the Scheer campaign poses to the VDC are complex; the solutions which have so far been proposed are simplistic. The question which has to date been debated ad nauseum is whether or not to "go into the Democratic Party." It has been a very formalistic discussion that makes it difficult to talk about real events. The "nature of the Democratic Party" will be argued at length and probably to exhaustion; but Scheer's decision to run in the Democratic party seems to be a closed issue, so we propose to turn our attention to other matters.

It has been effectively argued that even if we thought that the VDC could handle the job of running the campaign, and even if the VDC wanted to, it would be improper for the VDC to do so. The charge of imperialist designs by the VDC to colonize the 7th Congressional District would be valid. Since the 7th CD represents a community much larger than the campus, a congressional campaign for that district must be run by an organization that rempresents more than just the campus. Who then should run the campaign? A campaign committee has been established. It includes some VDC people, some "progressives", and some people either presently or recently in the CDC. The committee is either self-appointed or appointed by Scheer. Unfortunately, this committee can represent not one but itself. Few if any of its members are directly responsible to any base. The decisions of the committee will not be appealable to larger bodies or groups.

If the campaign is successful, it will involve thousands of activists and utilize much of the resources in the VDC. The Scheer campaign may in effect become The Movement, and the Scheer campaign committee will be in a position to set the tone of The Movement. When we talk about the Scheer campaign, then, we are not just talking about one activity among many others. We are talking about what may amount to a long-range structure and program for the entire anti-war movement in this area.

Before dealing with these general considerations, however, we want first to discuss some of the specific policy decisions the Scheer campaign will be facing:

The relationship of the Scheer campaign to the Democratic Party will have to be determined sooner or later. Will the committee claim to be in the best tradition of the Democratic Party, in the tradition of Jackson? of Kefauver? of Stevenson? of Kennedy? . . . Such a stand will get votes, will answer some telling criticisms. Or will the campaign committee, as we hope, announce its disloyalty and opposition to the Democratic Party. More specifically, will Scheer go on record as pledging that, if elected, he will refuse to vote the party line on the congressional questions which define party membership---the questions of organization of Congress, of committee assignments? Will he make it clear that he chose the Democratic primary as his arena for purely tactical reasons? Or, as the campaign progresses, will it take the position that it is contesting in the primary election rather than the general election because he wants to avoid splitting the

what is the tactical reason?

liberal Democratic majority in the district? In general, will the campaign be an attempt to reform the party or an attempt at radically attacking the Democratic Party and all it stands for? already decided

The crucial question in the campaign will be its position on the war. Scheer has always taken a militant stand and we expect him to continue to do so. Many of the campaign committee members, however, have been identified either personally or organizationally with a more moderate position on the war. They think it is too radical to say that the U.S. just doesn't belong in Vietnam and should get out. They prefer to talk about "de-escalation" and "peace feelers." How will this conflict be resolved within the campaign? Who will participate in this decision? well?

In 1962, H. Stuart Hughes, a Harvard professor, ran for U.S. Senator in Massachusetts on an independent peace platform. The campaign had radical beginnings, but once it was underway the following argument came up and eventually dominated the campaign: "Once we have announced our peace protest campaign, it is our responsibility to roll up the largest possible vote. It would be irresponsible to do anything that might interfere with our ability to accumulate votes, since a low vote will be a disaster. Therefore refusing to compromise our position would be irresponsible."

What weight will such an argument have during the Scheer campaign? Will it lead to compromises? Might it lead to an eventual destruction of the purposes of the campaign?

The campaign committee must make decisions on its policy in the ghetto. Will it promise that a vote for Scheer is a vote for bread and butter? Will it argue that since the liberal administration is unwilling to meet the basic needs of the ghetto, that the only hope of the ghetto is a vote for Scheer? Or will the Scheer campaign argue that a vote for him will, on the immediate level of bread and butter, get the ghetto less than a vote for Cohelan? Will Scheer point out that if elected, he will be such a pariah in Congress that he will be cut off from patronage precisely because he will raise basic questions? Will he urge a vote for him as an investment in building a better future, recognizing that today such a vote will probably result in a cutback in federal bread and butter benefits?

We have one final question. As the campaign proceeds, if it is done well, it will create and coordinate a great deal of political machinery. Hopefully much of this machinery will be of such a nature as to remain relevant and meaningful after the campaign ends. Will the campaign committee then become the directorate of this machinery? Will it continue to run the machine after the campaign ends or will it act as a seed around which some larger organization can grow? Even in the latter case, will the people from the campaign committee who wish to stay active be able to dominate this larger organization and really control basic decisions? Assuming again that this machinery continues to exist, what is the likelihood of it evolving into the kind of machine that is easily coopable by the Establishment? Historically, many of the nation's present machines were originally built by sincere reformers and radicals who lived to see the creature they had built become a powerful force against their own ideals.

We have raised what we think may be basic questions in the campaign. Although we have indicated our position on each of them, we have not taken the time to argue our case for them or for their importance. We believe that extensive debate is required on each of these questions. Unfortunately, if that debate takes place only within a campaign committee, then the campaign activists (and these will be largely campus people) will have no opportunity to take part. Unable to take part in the debate, they will also be unable to learn from the experience. If the wrong decisions are made, the campaign could become more of a disservice than a benefit both to the peace movement and to the radical movement. Campaign activists would be forced to carry out policies contrary to the whole style and direction of the radical movement.

Bob Scheer assures us that he will not "sell out" radical positions. Such assurances are really unnecessary. We know that he feels strongly enough about this war not to let anyone induce him to take a wishy-washy position. Scheer himself is not the issue. It is the Scheer campaign, as a movement with a structure, that concerns us.

Scheer will be making the speeches, but other people will be doing the organization. By April, these people---the campaign committee---will be in an extremely powerful position. They may not be able to make Scheer say things he doesn't believe, but they will be in a position to turn the labors and hopes of thousands of people into a gigantic abortion.

Suppose a majority of the campaign committee decides that certain compromises are necessary, compromises in the campaign's attitude toward the Democratic Establishment or even toward the war itself. It need not be a numerical majority, but just a handful of people on whom the organizational work depends. They feel so strongly about the need for compromise that they threaten to resign. There are then three possibilities, each of them disastrous. Scheer can make the compromise against his own better judgment, and sour the whole campaign. He can let them go ahead and resign, thus splitting the campaign at a crucial moment. Or he can resign himself, destroying the campaign completely. In any of these cases, thousands of people who had been loyal campaign workers will quit in disgust, vowing to keep out of politics for the rest of their lives.

It may be that no clear-cut "fight or die" issues ever arise. But there are many day-to-day decisions, small in themselves, which taken together determine the entire tone and style of the campaign. No matter how many assurances the campaign committee gives us, three months later the question of whether they in fact lived up to those assurances will be as controversial as anything else. When it comes to these "small" decisions, assurances won't do; we simply have to have confidence in the men who will be making them.

This means that we have to take a long, hard look at the campaign committee. It is difficult to do so now, because we haven't been told what the exact composition of the committee will be, or exactly how it will be selected. All we have to go on is the letter sent out last week urging support for the Scheer committee, with five signatures underneath, and a tentative list of other members of the committee.

We have raised what we think may be basic questions in the campaign. Although we have indicated our position on each of them, we have not taken the time to argue our case for them or for their importance. We believe that extensive debate is required on each of these questions. Unfortunately, if that debate takes place only within a campaign committee, then the campaign activists (and these will be largely campus people) will have no opportunity to take part. Unable to take part in the debate, they will also be unable to learn from the experience. If the wrong decisions are made, the campaign could become more of a disservice than a benefit both to the peace movement and to the radical movement. Campaign activists would be forced to carry out policies contrary to the whole style and direction of the radical movement.

Bob Scheer assures us that he will not "sell out" radical positions. Such assurances are really unnecessary. We know that he feels strongly enough about this war not to let anyone induce him to take a wishy-washy position. Scheer himself is not the issue. It is the Scheer campaign, as a movement with a structure, that concerns us.

Scheer will be making the speeches, but other people will be doing the organization. By April, these people---the campaign committee---will be in an extremely powerful position. They may not be able to make Scheer say things he doesn't believe, but they will be in a position to turn the labors and hopes of thousands of people into a gigantic abortion.

Suppose a majority of the campaign committee decides that certain compromises are necessary, compromises in the campaign's attitude toward the Democratic Establishment or even toward the war itself. It need not be a numerical majority, but just a handful of people on whom the organizational work depends. They feel so strongly about the need for compromise that they threaten to resign. There are then three possibilities, each of them disastrous. Scheer can make the compromise against his own better judgment, and sour the whole campaign. He can let them go ahead and resign, thus splitting the campaign at a crucial moment. Or he can resign himself, destroying the campaign completely. In any of these cases, thousands of people who had been loyal campaign workers will quit in disgust, vowing to keep out of politics for the rest of their lives.

It may be that no clear-cut "fight or die" issues ever arise. But there are many day-to-day decisions, small in themselves, which taken together determine the entire tone and style of the campaign. No matter how many assurances the campaign committee gives us, three months later the question of whether they in fact lived up to those assurances will be as controversial as anything else. When it comes to these "small" decisions, assurances won't do; we simply have to have confidence in the men who will be making them.

This means that we have to take a long, hard look at the campaign committee. It is difficult to do so now, because we haven't been told what the exact composition of the committee will be, or exactly how it will be selected. All we have to go on is the letter sent out last week urging support for the Scheer committee, with five signatures underneath, and a tentative list of other members of the committee.

Most of the names we recognize belong to men who have in the past been very active in and around reform Democrat circles. Some of them have in the past given us the impression that they see their role as taming the student movement and channelling it into "mainstream" politics.But since we don't know what the final composition of the campaign committee will be, we want at this point to sound a general warning. There is a tendency sometimes to refer to everyone who is not a student type ---- everyone over 30, say ---- as "representing the community." This results more from wishful thinking than anything else. Someone comes to us from "the community" and tells us in glowing terms about some community organization about which we know little or nothing; and we believe because we want to believe.

Whenever we enter any political venture, we can always foresee some possible political developments which might be dangerous. This should not necessarily deter us from taking part. The function of democracy in an organization is to give the individual a chance to present his disagreements with the way things are going, and the opportunity to change things by convincing others. We do not believe that any kind of structural democracy will be available to activists in the Scheer campaign. Those who aren't worried about the direction this campaign might take may not care about considerations of democracy ---- but we do. It seems that the campaign has already been sufficiently pre-structured so as to make it difficult ---- perhaps impossible ---- to restructure it on a democratic basis. Since mahy of the lines have not yet been clearly drawn, however, and since many of our conclusions are based on projections from the scanty information available so far, we do not rule out the possibility of reconsidering our position.

We shall return now to the question of the relationship of the Scheer campaign to the VDC and the possible effects of that campaign upon the VDC. Let's assume for the moment that the Scheer campaign goes forward essentially has been planned, and discuss the implications for the VDC. One possibility, and unfortunately it appears to be the most likely one, is that there will be no organizational ties at all between the VDC and the Scheer campaign. Many opponents and supporters of the Scheer campaign favor such a relationship. What will happen? Many VDC activists together with a significant part of the VDC staff will leave the VDC to join the campaign. The VDC is already losing three of its best staff people to Chicago. The burden upon those who remain in the organization will be crushing. They will probably find it impossible to maintain the VDC's heavy organizational overhead (paying bills, raising money for the NCC central office, answering the ever-increasing deluge of mail that pours in, arranging speakers, providing groups and individuals with literature, and much more). They will find it impossible to launch any of the new projects now being discussed; it will be enough work just to keep things going. It will be harder to raise funds both because the VDC will no longer be launching new projects or maintaining its air of vitality, and because the Scheer committee will be raising funds from roughly the same sources. (Very likely the campaign will even get to use our mailing list.)

Of those who orginally decide to stay with the VDC, many will come to feel that the VDC is too much trouble and will go over to the

campaign, "where it's at". We foresee this leading fairly soon to the collapse of the VDC. And that will be a great loss. If the VDC dies, the campaign committee will automatically become a sort of central committee of the local peace movement. With the campaign committee calling the shots, all new ideas will inevitably be judged in terms of the campaign. There would be little chance of survival for the many activities which, although not hostile to the Scheer campaign, would be of no interest to a group whose primary concern is electoral activity.

If the effect on the local scene of the VDC's collapse would be bleak, its national effect would be dismal. We are now in an unprecedented period of growth in the national anti-war movement. Across the country, at hundreds of colleges, committees against the war are forming. Most of these are fragile creatures, just beginning to grow. Many of them look to Berkeley as a model and a source of strength. Many of these committees even call themselves Vietnam Day committees. At our last meeting we implicitly recognized our responsibility to them by encouraging three of our most active members to go to Chicago. All plans for a national office assume an initial period during which the national office would depend heavily upon Berkeley for resources. Furthermore, there has been talk of developing programs here which, if they work, could be offered as examples to the rest of the country. A sudden collapse of the VDC would be a shock to groups and individuals across the country. In going down, we would leave behind just one message: the Berkeley committee dissolved to become a part of an electoral campaign in the Democratic primary. All the details, the debate before going into the Democratic primary, the differences between this campaign and the normal liberal Democratic primary campaign ---- the rest of the country would know nothing of these. The lesson they would inevitably draw is the last one we would want them to.

Therefore we are convinced that the preservation of the VDC is very important. Is it possible? We don't know. We have, however, certain suggestions concerning a relationship of the VDC to the Scheer campaign which might work. We do not intend them as a motion; we wish merely to provoke discussion on the kinds of problems we have outlined. Our proposal follows:

1) That the VDC request of the Scheer campaign committee the primary responsibility for campus mobilization of activities in support of the campaign.

2) That the VDC request one seat on the campaign committee for a a person elected by the VDC, responsible to the VDC, and recallable by the VDC.

3) That a specified number of VDC staff people (to be determined and subject to change) be assigned to work on the campaign as their primary VDC assignment.

4) That the VDC urge all members who oppose the campaign to stay in the VDC and work on VDC projects which are not directly connected with the campaign, with the understanding that even though the VDC as an organization is working on the campaign, VDC members

do not therefore automatically become supporters of the Scheer campaign.

5) That all VDC members and staff (whether active in the campaign or opposed to it) all share in maintaining the organizational overhead of the VDC.

6) That all VDC members, those supporting the campaign and those opposed to it, treat one another fraternally. This means that opponents should not become oppositionists, and supporters should keep up their share of the overhead and respect the principles of the opponents.

7) That the VDC should request of the campaign committee specific project assignments and area assignments, thereby carrying out some of the campaign work as an organization.rather than as a collection of individuals who happen to belong to the VDC.

We hope that it will be clear how these proposals may be a partial solution to the problems we have discussed. This paper is already very long, and we do not want to take up more room by discussing the specific merits or short-comings of these proposals. Moreover, we want to focus attention on the problems themselves rather than on the proposals we have suggested by way of illustrating a possible solution.